

Date: Fri, 15 Jul 94 04:30:15 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #310  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 15 Jul 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 310

## Today's Topics:

3rd Party Traffic?????  
CW ... My view.  
Existing regulations  
Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 13 Jul 94 22:40:03 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
newsrelay.iastate.edu!cobra.uni.edu!parickj4560@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 3rd Party Traffic?????  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hey everyone, I have had my ham ticket for 5 moths and my General class for 4.

I just got my brother interested in ham radio today and he made some contacts on 10 Meters using my rig with me next to him.

He would call cq and give my call with his own name. It was all going cool when some lady in Washington said that I should always announce "third party traffic" when he talks. Is this the rules, and if so, at what time and who should be the one saying it????? thanks

- jmp - NOZYA

-----

Date: 14 Jul 1994 13:20:42 GMT  
From: swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
isuvax.iastate.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW ... My view.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <395@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:  
>Sorry, Cecil, but IMHO that doesn't wash. My argument here is that one  
>benefit of CW is that CW rigs are the easiest for a beginner to  
>understand and build and operate to the satisfaction of the builder, so  
>that he (or she) is rewarded enough to continue on to further  
>experimentation. The same cannot be said of SS (if it were so, think of  
>all the SS rigs that would be being built by new no-codes). Your  
>argument is akin to saying, instead of having all children learn the  
>alphabet, so that some may go on to study Shakespeare, all children  
>should learn Shakespeare, so that some may go on to study the  
>alphabet. Producing a carrier is relatively simple and it is quite  
>fundamental, and CW provides something useful and rewarding to do with  
>that carrier. Tell me a project of equivalent simplicity and  
>performance that a no-code can build?

Sorry, Mike, but IMO, that doesn't wash either.

I agree that turning a carrier on and off is basic to all other radio, but I  
fail to see how knowing morse code is. This seems to be like learning Old  
English so you can then study modern literature.

-----  
Date: 14 Jul 1994 13:27:14 GMT  
From: swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
isuvax.iastate.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Existing regulations  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <d3.553.126@alley.com>, john.hiatt@alley.com (John Hiatt) writes:  
>I find a problem with this. Isn't ordering a pizza facilitating the  
>affairs of a business? I thought that was illegal use of a phone patch.  
>What am I missing here?

You're missing the changes to part 97. It is now legal to order a pizza by  
autopatch, as long as you don't do it regularly, or as long as you don't profit  
by the phone call.

-----

Date: 14 Jul 1994 03:45:03 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 6384@ke4zv.atl.ga.us, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CstCEz.7t7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>In article <2vsnsH\$a3k@src-news.pa.dec.com> ira@src.dec.com (Ira Machefsky) writes:

>>>...but we don't ask brain surgeons to know anything about Phrenology, do we?

>>>Or lawyers anything about medieval English case law. As technology and times

>>>change, so do the requirements for entry into a field.

>>

>>The problem with your statement is that about half of all QSO's on

>>HF are via CW, and CW-only QRP rigs and kits are being sold as fast

>>as they are being produced.

>

>So? Phrenologists and astrologers still practice their "crafts" today too.

>We still don't require brain surgeons to be "competent" in phrenology, or

>require astronomers to be competent at figuring horoscopes, or require

>physicians to be competent in the application of leeches, or to be barbers

>as they once were. That some may continue to perform such archaic practices

>should not be considered evidence for the requirement of such entrance

>exams for their professions. (Note, barbering is even a \*useful\* skill,

>but physicians don't have to pass a barber exam even though cutting hair

>may still be incidental to their craft.)

Let's be honest. Flat out, straight on honest. CW is the Freemason's handshake, it is the Bill W. of AlAnon, it is the fish of Christianity, the lambda of gay/bi groups, the particular handsignal of the 8-tray Crips.

Discussing the relevance of CW with the folks that seem to profess that CW by itself defines relevance is essentially pointless.

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

\*

\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

Date: 14 Jul 1994 13:24:41 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!

moe.ksu.ksu.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
isuvax.iastate.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Csx3EK.9Mt@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Not true! I used to be dead against the nocode tech license, but I  
>have changed my way of thinking. A knowledge of code is not necessary  
>to operate on VHF and UHF. I would like to see a severe theory test  
>being given to the nocode techs, though.

>

>But I continue to honestly believe that code skills should be required  
>for HF access.

Jeff,

What makes it necessary to know morse code to operate phone on the HF bands and not on VHF and UHF??

-----

Date: Thu, 14 Jul 1994 06:11:34 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vsnsn\$a3k@src-news.pa.dec.com>, <CstCEz.7t7@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Jul13.210513.6384@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>Æ

Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <1994Jul13.210513.6384@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CstCEz.7t7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>In article <2vsnsn\$a3k@src-news.pa.dec.com> ira@src.dec.com (Ira Machefsky) writes:

>>>...but we don't ask brain surgeons to know anything about Phrenology, do we?  
>>>Or lawyers anything about medieval English case law. As technology and times  
>>>change, so do the requirements for entry into a field.

>>

>>The problem with your statement is that about half of all QSO's on  
>>HF are via CW, and CW-only QRP rigs and kits are being sold as fast  
>>as they are being produced.

>

>So? Phrenologists and astrologers still practice their "crafts" today too.  
>We still don't require brain surgeons to be "competent" in phrenology, or  
>require astronomers to be competent at figuring horoscopes, or require  
>physicians to be competent in the application of leeches, or to be barbers

>as they once were. That some may continue to perform such archaic practices  
>should not be considered evidence for the requirement of such entrance  
>exams for their professions. (Note, barbering is even a \*useful\* skill,  
>but physicians don't have to pass a barber exam even though cutting hair  
>may still be incidental to their craft.)

The problem with your statement is that about half of all QSO's on  
HF are via CW, and CW-only QRP rigs and kits are being sold as fast  
as they are being produced.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Wed, 13 Jul 1994 21:05:13 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <77396187534n12@131.168.114.12>, <2vsnsh\$a3k@src-news.pa.dec.com>,  
<CstCEz.7t7@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <CstCEz.7t7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
writes:

>In article <2vsnsh\$a3k@src-news.pa.dec.com> ira@src.dec.com (Ira Machefsky)  
writes:

>>...but we don't ask brain surgeons to know anything about Phrenology, do we?  
>>Or lawyers anything about medieval English case law. As technology and times  
>>change, so do the requirements for entry into a field.

>

>The problem with your statement is that about half of all QSO's on  
>HF are via CW, and CW-only QRP rigs and kits are being sold as fast  
>as they are being produced.

So? Phrenologists and astrologers still practice their "crafts" today too.  
We still don't require brain surgeons to be "competent" in phrenology, or  
require astronomers to be competent at figuring horoscopes, or require  
physicians to be competent in the application of leeches, or to be barbers  
as they once were. That some may continue to perform such archaic practices  
should not be considered evidence for the requirement of such entrance  
exams for their professions. (Note, barbering is even a \*useful\* skill,  
but physicians don't have to pass a barber exam even though cutting hair  
may still be incidental to their craft.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #310

\*\*\*\*\*